



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,404	10/31/2003	Rick Pallante	NOR-1128	2114
37172	7590	06/04/2009		
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP (NORDSON)			EXAMINER	
2700 CAREW TOWER			SELLMAN, CACHET I	
441 VINE STREET				
CINCINNATI, OH 45202			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/04/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

krooney@whepatent.com
mhines@whepatent.com
usptodock@whepatent.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/699,404	Applicant(s) PALLANTE ET AL.
	Examiner CACHET I. SELLMAN	Art Unit 1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 11-19 and 23-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 11-14, 16-19, 23-25 and 27-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 15 and 26 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 11-14, 16-17, 19, 23-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bright in view of Bowers US (4537150) and Hoffer et al (US 6190739).

Bright discloses a hot-melt adhesive arrangement and glue application system that has a controller (60) operating a melting unit (30) which comprises wirelessly receiving information on at least one system condition (height in tank, color of adhesive, temperature or viscosity) into the controller and using the received information during the operation of the melting unit (page 8, line 18-page 9, line 10).

Bright teaches operating a hot melt adhesive dispensing system (abstract) having a controller operating a melting unit (page 9, lines 3-6) which comprises receiving information from a (sensor) regarding the adhesive being dispensed, utilizing the information in the controller to set a system condition of the system and operating the system according to the condition (page 8, line 18 – page 9 line 10)

Bright does not teach receiving the information from a machine readable element as required by **claim 23**.

However, it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made to use barcodes for accurately inputting data into a computer system to reduce the human error involved in manually inputting data as shown with Bowers (US 4537150). Bowers discloses using barcodes to measure volumes of liquids to input information into a computer (see abstract and col. 1, line 64- col. 2, line 2). Bowers teaches that the barcode can be indicative have volume, temperature, vessel identification (col. 9, line 33-41). Bowers further states that the barcode can be placed on the vessel which is being monitored.

Hoffer et al. discloses a process for spraying lacquers where the lacquer containers are labeled with information regarding the contents in order to establish and or verify an operation system condition (see col. 8, lines 56-62).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process Bright et al. to use the barcodes as taught by Bowers or Hoffer et al. in order to identify the adhesive being used in the dispenser and adjust the parameters/ system conditions for the specific adhesive which can element human error.

The information can be used to set an application temperature, an over temperature condition and establishing/verifying a setback temperature of the adhesive (page 9, lines 3-9) as required by **claims 11-13**. The information can be used to set a warning condition in the controller (page 8, lines 29- page 9, line 3) as required by **claim 14**. The information from the barcode can be color or viscosity, which identifies the adhesive (page 9, lines 1-10 and Bowers) as required by **claim 16**. The barcode can be

used to monitor the height of the tank which will control the pump therefore determine the amount of adhesive in the unit (page 8, lines 18-26) as required by **claim 17**. The information is located on the container as taught by Bowers as required **claim 19**. The information is located on the hot melt adhesive as taught by Bowers as required by **claim 24**.

The information can be received electronically and optically as required by **claims 25 and 27**.

3. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bright in view of Bowers and Hoffer et al. as applied above.

As to claim 26, it is well known in the art that a magnetic machine readable element is a known alternative to a barcode as evident by Hannigen et al. Hannigen et al. discloses that it is well known to use machine readable element such as a barcode to automatically input data. Hannigen et al. further shows that alternate forms of machine readable identification includes magnetic stripe, magnetic ink, optical and radio frequency. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Bright modified by Bowers and Hoffer et al. to include the use of a magnetic machine readable element because the substitution of one known element for another yields predictable results of automatically reading and inputting the data from the readable element.

4. Claims 11, 16, 18-19, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson Jr. in view of Bowers (US 4537150) and Hoffer et al.

Jackson Jr. discloses a process for operating a hot melt adhesive system (abstract) having a controller operating a melting unit (heater) (col. 3, lines 9-13). Jackson Jr. discloses the use of a controller to control the temperature of the hot melt adhesive by manually inputting the information (col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 15).

Jackson Jr. does not teach wirelessly receiving information on at least one system condition into the controller from a machine readable element, and using information during the operation of the melting unit as required by **claim 23**.

However, it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made to use barcodes for inputting data into a computer system to reduce the human error involved in manually inputting data as shown with Bowers (US 4537150). Bowers discloses using barcodes to measure volumes of liquids to input information into a computer (see abstract and col. 1, line 64- col. 2, line 2). Bowers teaches that the barcode can be indicative have volume, temperature, vessel identification (col. 9, line 33-41). Bowers further states that the barcode can be placed on the vessel which is being monitored. it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Jackson Jr. to include the barcode of Bowers in order to prevent human error with manually inputting the process parameters.

Hoffer et al. discloses a process for spraying lacquers where the lacquer containers are labeled with information regarding the contents in order to establish and or verify an operation system condition (see col. 8, lines 56-62).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process Bright et al. to use the barcodes as taught by Bowers or Hoffer et al. in order to identify the adhesive being used in the dispenser and adjust the parameters/ system conditions for the specific adhesive which can element human error.

The information is used to set a temperature of the adhesive rather than manually inputting the set point temperature as shown in (col. 3, line 60 - col. 4, line 15) as required by **claim 11**. The information received can identify the type of adhesive as required by **claim 16**. The information is logged into a database (see Bowers) as required by **claim 18**. The barcode is located on the container holding the adhesive (Bowers) as required by **claim 19**.

As shown by Bowers the information is received from the container holding the adhesive as required by **claim 24**. The information is received using a scanner (see Bowers col. 4, line 29-30) therefore the information in optically received as required by **claim 25**.

5. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson Jr. in view of Bowers and Hoffer et al. as applied above and in further view of Fort (US 5700322).

The teachings of Jackson Jr. in view of Bowers and Hoffer et al. as applied to claim 23 are as stated above. However, the combined references fail to teach setting a flushing system condition using the machine readable element.

However, it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to use a manifold to connect to a hot melt adhesive dispenser in order to provide a flushing system which is used to prevent clogging of the dispense as taught by Fort. The flushing system is connected through a hose and a cleaning fluid is pumped from the system to the adhesive manifold through a control valve. It would have it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Jackson Jr. as modified above to include a flushing system by using a manifold in order to clean the dispenser between use to prevent clogging which can affect the performance of the dispenser.

Fort further states that not all adhesives have the same flushing conditions such as polyurethane adhesives. Fort states it is difficult to flush polyurethane hot melt adhesives within a dispenser. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the information on the barcode identifying the adhesive in the container as suggested by Hoffer et al. to set flushing conditions since Fort teaches that not all hot melt adhesives have the same flushing/ cleaning conditions.

6. Claims 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson Jr. in view of Bowers and Hoffer et al. as applied to 23 above in further view of Droz (US 7012530)

The teachings of Jackson Jr. in view of Bowers and Hoffer et al. as applied to claim 23 are stated above.

Jackson Jr. and Bowers fail to teach receiving the information from an electronic chip as required by **claim 29**.

Droz teaches an electronic label which is used to read information that identifies an object. Droz teaches that labels with electronic chips are replacing labels with bar codes in automatic manufacturing cycles and it allows identification of the object (col. 1, lines 32-40). Droz teaches that the info is read through a radio signal and can be read from a scanner.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Jackson Jr in view of Bowers to include the use of a label having an electronic chip as taught by Droz. One would have been motivated to do so because both teach reading information from a label and Droz further teaches how bar codes are replaced with electronic chips because of the accuracy and ability to identify and object in an automated manufacturing environment.

As stated above the information is read through an antenna (radio signal) as required by **claim 28**.

As stated in paragraph 6 above, it is obvious to place the label on the container of the adhesive as required by **claim 30**. The electronic chip can be read using a scanner as required by **claim 31**. As taught by Droz, in an automatic system the electronic chip is read once the object in a proximity of the system as required by **claim 32**.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 3/2/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the reference cited fails to teach providing information

on a machine readable element that identifies the adhesive material. However, the Examiner disagrees, the passage in Hoffer states "[I]t is advantageous for the small containers to carry a feature **identifying** their contents, e.g. a bar code which may be automatically read **prior to opening the small container.** In a preferred manner, the bar code **may also** be used moreover to supply application data pertaining to the lacquer" (see col. 8, lines 55-56-58). This passage shows support for supplying a bar code which has information about the contents of the container so one will know what is inside without having to open the container as well as providing application data. The applicant's interpretation of the passage only teaching providing the application data i.e. system conditions is erroneous. The passage clearly states using a barcode to identify the contents of a container which is required by the claim.

Conclusion

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CACHET I. SELLMAN whose telephone number is

(571)272-0691. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00 - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cachet I Sellman
Examiner
Art Unit 1792

/C. I. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Timothy H Meeks/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792